

REMARKS

In the June 2, 2004, Office Action, it was noted that Applicants' nonpublication request was not rescinded, that the invention disclosed in the present patent application is the subject of WO 2002/061955, EP 1330882, and AU 2002249880, and that there was no notification of the foreign (or multilateral) filings. Accordingly, it was indicated that the application would be held abandoned, and that Applicants should file a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)(f).

The Examiner noted Applicants election of the claims in Group IV without traverse. Claims 1-12 and 20-28 were withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to nonelected inventions.

On the merits, Claims 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Houck. Claims 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamanaka et al. Claims 13, 14, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Kunkel. Claim 19 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate the indication by the Examiner that Claim 19 contains allowable subject matter.

First, with regard to the failure to withdraw the nonpublication request, Applicants are concurrently filing a Petition to Revive. That document is not included with this

Amendment A since it is directed to a different mail stop. Applicants were unaware of this issue, since prior counsel for Applicants evidently made this error in the present application and a number of other related Applications, and Applicants' undersigned attorney is currently in the process of correcting these errors. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's notation of this issue, and are sincerely appreciative of the Examiner bringing the issue to Applicants' attention.


The withdrawn claims have been cancelled, as have Claims 14, 16, and 17, and the remaining claims have been amended. Claim 19 has been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of base Claim 13 upon which it depended, and accordingly Claim 19 should now be allowable. New Claims 29-52 have been added.

Each of independent Claims 13, 37, and 45 is believed to patentably define the present invention over the references cited by the Examiner in the June 2, 2004, Office Action. Each of these independent claims now includes the limitation that the claimed apparatus communicates in two directions with a communication device, a feature of the present invention which is not taught or suggested anywhere in the cited references. Additionally, independent Claim 13 also includes limitations derived from Claims 14, 16, and 17. Independent Claims 37 and 45 also include limitations which are not taught or suggested in the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully believe that each of independent Claims 13, 37, and 45 patentably define the present invention over the

cited references, and request favorable consideration and allowance of these claims as well as the claims which are dependent upon these claims.

Accordingly, Claims 13, 15, 18, 19, and 29-52 remain pending and are believed to be in condition for allowance at this time. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, with an early and favorable decision being solicited. Should the Examiner believe that the prosecution of the application could be expedited, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted:

BY 
Leslie S. Miller
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 30,662

Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren s.c.
1000 North Water Street, Suite 2100
Milwaukee, WI 53202

(414) 298-8321

Customer No. 22922

MW/1139383